DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 107 194 HE 006 595

AUTHOR Dinsmore, John C.
TITLE Women as Cadets: An Analysis of the Issue.
PUB DATE May 74
NOTE 87p.; Master's Thesis, Auburn University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Admission Criteria; Educational Planning; *Females; *Higher Education; *Military Schools; *Sex Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS *Air Force Academy

ABSTRACT

With its growing influence and power, the women's movement is directing pressure on the Air Force to permit women to attend the Air Force Academy. This study traces the history of the women's movement in America and examines the specific avenues by which the present Air Force policy against admitting women to the academy could be abrogated. Consideration is given to the sociological basis of "female inequality" and the associated complexities of transitioning to a coeducational institution. Air Force policy and planning for the eventual admission of female cadets is reviewed and found satisfactory; however, there are some actions which should be undertaken soon in order to prevent potential hardships and embarrassment. (Author)

ED107194

HE

AIR COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE

WOMEN AS CADETS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE ISSUE

By

John C. Dinsmore, 307-42-7479FR

Major, USAF, 1939-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A RESEARCH STUDY SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

May 1974

HE 006 595

AIR UNIVERSITY

MAXWELL AIR FORCE BASE, ALABAMA

2/3

A RESEARCH PAPER

Submitted to

The Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Master of Public Administration

AUBURN, ALABAMA

May 1974

ABSTRACT

With its growing influence and power, the women's movement is directing pressure on the Air Force to permit women to attend the Air Force Academy. This study traces the history of the women's movement in America and examines the specific avenues by which the present Air Force policy against admitting women to the Academy could be abrogated. Consideration is given to the sociological basis of "female inequality" and the associated complexities of transitioning to a coeducational institution. Air Force policy and planning for the eventual admission of female cadets is reviewed and found satisfactory; however, there are some actions which should be undertaken soon in order to prevent potential hardships and embarrassment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem
Objectives of the Study
Limitations
Assumptions
Definitions
Organization of the Study

II. THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IN AMERICA. 7

The Movement from 1920 to the 1960's
The Movement from 1960 to 1974
The Future of the Movement
Summary

III. THE CONSTITUTION, THE CONGRESS, AND THE COURTS 15

The Equal Rights Amendment
Legislation Before Congress
The Court Suit
Summary

IV. SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND EQUALITY. 30

The Basis of Inequality
Social Expectations of Coeducation
Preparing for the Transition
Summary

V. THE AIR FORCE POSITION 41

The Air Force Trend
Air Force Policy on Female Cadets
The Air Force Academy Plan
Summary

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 52

Conclusions
Recommendations
Concluding Statement

FOOTNOTES 56

APPENDIX A 67

APPENDIX B 68

APPENDIX C 71

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

> . . . the principle which regulates the existing social relations between the two sexes - the legal subordination of one sex to the other - is wrong in itself and now one of the chief hinderances to human improvement; and that it ought to be replaced by a principle of perfect equality, admitting no power or privilege on the one side, nor disability on the other.[1]

The above commentary on the inequality of the sexes could very well have come from any of the recent books, articles, or other publications detailing today's women's movement. In actuality, it was written in 1869 by John Stuart Mill in his essay "The Subjection of Women."

The history of the women's movement in the United States dates back over 125 years. During this time, the movement has experienced periods of relative dormancy as well as periods of great activity. It is clear that the country witnessed a major revival of the women's movement in the past decade. Today, the movement is a significant factor in our society and the topic of a growing body of research and discussion.[2]

The military establishment has definitely felt the influence of the new women's movement. As a result, it

1

has had to revise some old policies and implement new policies to cope with the problems and challenges which the movement has introduced. Because the military is a major institution in our society, it has received both criticism and praise for its efforts to ensure equal opportunity for women.[3] Indeed, the military services have taken positive steps toward equal opportunity in the areas of assignments, job opportunity, and promotion; however, continued pressure for equal opportunity and admission of females into what have been previously all-male domains is certain.

Statement of the Problem

One of the most traditional male domains in the military is the military academy system. Ms. Nancy Goldman, a Research Associate at the University of Chicago, has made the following observation concerning the issue of female attendance at the service academies:

> Both symbolically and in terms of a professional role, the incorporation of women into the military establishment will result in pressure for women graduates from the military academies.[4]

There are three manifestations of this pressure to admit women to the academies: (1) the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, (2) legislation pending in Congress, and (3) legal action in the courts.

As the issue becomes more newsworthy and of potential significance to the Air Force, it is important for the Air Force to avoid embarrassment and face the issue objectively. Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky has stated:

> If the military establishment is not to be a continuing source of bitterness and divisiveness within the country, and if it is to be effective even in limited ways, it must assume a lower and more flexible posture. . . .[5]

The United States Air Force policy toward accepting females as Air Force Academy Cadets must not contribute to bitterness and divisiveness within the country.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objectives of this paper are to explore the issue of accepting female cadets at the Air Force Academy and determine the adequacy of Air Force policy relative to the issue.

Limitations

Each of the military services has policies, traditions, and images which are unique to that service and its academy. Recognizing that individual service policies may lack practical significance once a female enters any one of the academies, this study is limited to the consideration of females entering the Air Force Academy.

A second limitation is the cutoff date for the inclusion of new research data in this study. The dynamic

nature of events surrounding the movement to admit women to the Air Force Academy and the interrelationship between pending legal and legislative actions makes it necessary to select a point-in-time wherein various actions relating to the issue can be frozen. Consequently, this paper does not consider any events related to the issue which occurred after 12 February 1974.

As a third limitation, no attempt is made to conduct a detailed examination of the plans for transitioning the Air Force Academy to a coeducational institution. However, the general approach and philosophy of the plans will be explored.

Finally, the issue of admitting women to the Air Force Academy embodies the controversial sub-issues of the rights of female cadets to: (1) receive government provided contraceptive devices, (2) give birth out of wedlock, and (3) have legal abortions. These issues are each worthy of separate research and are not addressed in this study.

Assumptions

The writer made the following assumptions for this study:

1. With the possible exception of slight modifications for strength and physiological differences, male

and female nominees will compete on an equal basis for appointment to the Air Force Academy.

2. Sufficient numbers of female applicants will be available and appointed to meet minimum Air Force Academy requirements.[6]

Definitions

Women's movement - also called the feminist movement. The Christian Science Monitor provides an excellent definition of the women's movement: ". . . a yearning of women for fulfillment and for the full expression of their potential in society."[7] Within the movement, there are numerous varieties of groups, styles, and organizations. The term "women's rightist" is used to describe the larger, more moderate branch of the movement. On the other hand, "women's liberationist" is used to describe the smaller, more radical branch of the movement.[8]

Organization of the Study

This chapter has provided necessary introductory information. Because the demands to admit women to the Air Force Academy are rooted in the American women's movement, the origins and directions of that movement are examined in Chapter II. In Chapter III, the ongoing Constitutional, legislative, and legal efforts that would

permit females to enter the Academy are reviewed. Next, Chapter IV explores the sociological aspects of the issue and considers the potential effects of a coeducational Academy. The Air Force has not ignored this issue, and its position relative to admitting women to the Academy is contained in Chapter V. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are contained in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER II

THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

> Let woman share the rights, and she will emulate the virtues of man; for she must grow more perfect when emancipated, or justify the authority that chains such a weak being to her duty.[1]

So wrote an Englishwoman, Mary Wollstonecraft, in 1792. Her name appears in much of the recent feminist literature, and she is considered the original theoretician of the American women's movement, albeit years ahead of her time.[2] The year 1848 is normally cited as the official beginning of the movement in this country. In that year at a "women's convention" in Seneca Falls, New York, Elizabeth Cady Stanton publically read a demand for equal rights for all people called the "'Declaration of Principles'" which was patterned after the Declaration of Independence.[3] Interestingly, these early feminists were active and dedicated abolitionists, and the abolition of slavery served as the catalyst for the formation of the women's movement.[4]

After the Civil War settled the issue of slavery, the women's movement was able to direct its full attention toward women's rights.[4] Gaining the right to vote

was the movement's most important aim; however, the movement also sought to eliminate economic discrimination, limited educational opportunities, and the traditional view of "women's place."[6] In addition, the publication in 1869 of John Stuart Mill's essay, cited earlier, provided the women's movement with a "handmade text."[7]

The leaders of the post-Civil War feminist movement possessed an extremely masculine outlook, and they employed the appropriate mannerisms. They asserted their independence by assuming male clothing styles, speech, and similar adaptations. Further, they made every effort to gain entry into higher education, all-male careers, and male social life. The movement affected virtually every aspect of American life.[8]

In addition to competent leadership, there were other forces at work which contributed to the growth and development of the movement. After the Civil War, industrialization of the country began to emerge as a social force. Sociologist Ian Weinberg states that industrialization and the emergence of the industrial middle classes ". . . was inextricably linked to the emancipation of women. . .," because industrialization accommodated and encouraged the proliferation of women's organizations.[9] In the same vein, Ms. Caroline Bird

makes the point that the Industrial Revolution served to emphasize the differences between men and women and thereby sharpen women's demand for equality.[10] Indeed, there is wide agreement among contemporary authors that the Industrial Revolution holds a key position in the evolution of the American women's movement.

The combination of strong leadership and agreeable social circumstances helped the women's movement achieve its primary goal--gaining for women the right to vote. This first phase of the women's movement culminated in a long and difficult state-by-state effort to gain ratification of the Sufferage Amendment. Finally, on 26 August 1920, the Nineteenth Amendment became part of the Constitution, and women gained a measure of equality.[11]

The Movement from 1920 to the 1960's

After the 72 year effort to gain the vote, the women's movement entered a period of relative quiet.[12] Kate Millett, a prominent women's movement author, says the first phase of the movement ended in reform rather than revolution. She claims that "While patriarchal ideology was eroded and patriarchy reformed, the essential patriarchal social order remained."[13]

Although quiet, the second phase of the women's

movement was not totally devoid of feminist activity. The first proposal for an Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution was introduced in Congress in 1923.[14] In 1941, Pearl Buck sensed a discontent among American women and raised the question:

> Why, in a country such as ours, where woman is given every privilege and as much opportunity apparently as she wants, should she be so often dissatisfied in herself and so restless an influence in society?[15]

World War II saw womanpower become a most critical element in the industrial life of the country.[16] The war also put over 266,000 women in uniform;[17] however, the influence of Freudian theory and related ideas which surfaced in the 1930's is often viewed as stifling any improvement in the trend toward equality of the sexes. Indeed, the women of the 1940's and 1950's are often viewed as being caught in a trap of Freudian philosophy.[18]

The Movement From 1960 to 1974

The origin of the contemporary women's movement is found in the early 1960's and is centered in three events:[19]

1. In December 1961, President Kennedy established the President's Commission on the Status of Women.[20]

2. In 1963, Ms. Betty Friedan published her book The Feminine Mystique.[21]

3. Congress added sex as a basis for equal employment in the 1964 Civil Rights Act.[22]

In 1963, Messrs Farber and Wilson perceived a general movement in the direction of equal rights for women and described it as ". . . revolutionary as anything this age has seen. . . ."[23] Betty Friedan crystalized the new movement with the words:

> We can no longer ignore that voice within women that says: "I want something more than my husband and my children and my home."[24]

On 30 June 1966, the current women's movement was formally organized ". . . in a Washington (DC) hotel room, where a dozen or so women gathered with Betty Friedan to discuss strategies at the Third National Conference of Commissions on the status of women," and the National Organization of Women (NOW) was born.[25]

One scholar of the women's movement, Ms. Jo Freeman, attributes the revival of the movement to the growth of communications between interested people:

> It was not until a communications network developed among like-minded people beyond local boundaries that the movement could emerge and develop past the point of occasional, spontaneous uprising.[26]

Since World War II, there has been little change in the "socioeconomic strain" experienced by women; however, the communications network has radically changed the organizational situation.[27] Coupled with this, Ms.

Freeman sees a series of "crises" which "galvanized" people into action as an essential element in the growth of the women's movement.[28] "Nothing makes desire for change more acute than a crisis."[29]

Clearly, the 1960's was a period of reemergence and growth of the women's movement. There is ample evidence suggesting that women faced severe discrimination in employment practices and the political life of the country.[30] Although much of the current literature indicates some increased opportunity for women in these fields, the major gains are yet to come.

The Future of the Movement

As the women's movement reaches more of the young, middle-income women, its leadership will need to reassess their strategy in order to make the "call for equality" more meaningful and relevant to this greater number of women.[31] The movement is presently beset with regionalism, factionalism, and individualism; however, it has thus far been able to withstand these dysfunctional elements.[32] Betty Friedan, still recognized as the most influential leader of the feminist movement, is quoted as saying the movement "' is too diverse to splinter.'"[33] Ms. Friedan says she is ". . . sick of fighting Gloria (Steinam), Bella (Abzug), Jill (Ruckelshaus), the power

brokers, and the manipulators of the women's movement."[34] Ms. Friedan senses that the movement ". . . has reached a plateau from which it must find a new direction or retreat in disarray. . . ."[35]

The new direction of the movement seems to be toward moderation. In January 1973, Dr. Edward Eddy, President of all-female Chatham College, noted that many women were unhappy with the extreme elements of the feminist movement. From his contacts with the feminist movement, Dr. Eddy detects a general acceptance of the moderate approach and views it as the emerging trend in the movement.[36] Moderation is also reflected in the reduced impetus for ratification of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment by state legislatures.[37] Further, Ms. Ivy Bottini, one of the early organizers of NOW, recognizes a trend toward moderation; however, she believes moderation is causing the movement to stagnate.[38] Regardless of any shift in the tenor of the movement, it is a social force which will be on the American scene for some time to come.

Summary

The women's movement has a long history as a social force in American society.[39] What might be called the "modern" phase of the movement has its origins in the

early 1960's. Today, the movement is experiencing some diversity in political view with a concomitant lack of unanimous agreement on the future directions of the movement. Although the moderate elements of the movement appear to be gaining in importance, there is no reason to expect a lessening in the social importance of the women's movement.

The women's movement is largely responsible for mobilizing opinion and gaining support for the idea of permitting women to attend the Air Force Academy. In the following chapter, the principal methods by which the Air Force could be forced to change its policy against admitting women to the Academy will be examined.

CHAPTER III

THE CONSTITUTION, THE CONGRESS, AND THE COURTS

> Although unique in many respects, to a significant degree the Air Force Academy shares with civilian institutions the societal stresses that have beset the Nation.[1]

The above comment was made by William Leavitt, former senior editor of Air Force magazine, after he visited the Air Force Academy in 1973. He noted that one of the stresses being felt by the Academy is a growing pressure to admit females as cadets. In fact, there is action currently underway on three fronts which could remove the existing barriers that prevent women from entering the Academy. These actions are: (1) ratification of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, (2) passage of legislation currently before the Congress, and (3) adjudication of a pending court case. The outcome of any one of these ongoing actions could result in women becoming members of future classes. In this chapter, each of these potential avenues of change will be examined.

The Equal Rights Amendment

Resolutions proposing an equal rights amendment have

been introduced in almost every Congress since 1923. The wording of the proposed amendments has changed little over the years, and the various proposals generally received favorable committee action; however, it was not until 22 March 1972 that final Congressional acceptance was achieved. On that date, after almost 50 years of debate and consideration, Congress passed, with a final spirited debate in the Senate, House Joint Resolution 208--the Equal Rights Amendment.[2]

The proposed amendment, as submitted to the state legislatures for ratification, reads as follows:

ARTICLE--

> Section 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.
>
> Section 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.
>
> Section 3. This amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification.[3]

Thirty-eight states must ratify the proposed amendment before 22 March 1979 if it is to become the law of the land.[4] As of 12 February 1974, 33 states had ratified the amendment.[5]

Over the years, the proposed amendment has stirred a maelstrom of controversy. The debate between proponents and opponents spans a range of topics from personal

privacy in restrooms to military service obligations. Proponents of the amendment justify its need based on the many areas of law and custom in which sex discrimination exists. They see actual discrimination in many of the "protective" state and federal statutes which give special and supposedly preferred status to women in such areas as maximum hours of employment, permissible work categories, and general working conditions. On the other hand, opponents of the amendment say such "protective" legislation is not only desirable, but absolutely necessary. The opponents fear that adoption of the amendment would nullify many of the benefits given to women (especially working women) by such laws.[6]

In 1963, the President's Commission on the Status of Women opposed passage of an equal rights amendment. Their review of congressional debate on the issue led them to the conclusion that such an amendment would not require identical legal treatment of the sexes. For example, the Commission referred to the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1962 (Senate Report 2192, 87th Congress, 2nd Session) as evidence that an equal rights amendment would not require equal treatment of men and women for purposes of military service any more than all men are treated equally for purposes of military duty; however, the Commission did agree that

women would no longer be draft exempt under the amendment. In any event, the Commission did not support the concept of an equal rights amendment. Rather, it recommended definitive court pronouncements, especially from the Supreme Court, with regard to the validity of discriminatory laws under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution.[7]

Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. is among the staunchest opponents of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment, and he argued vigorously against its passage right up to the final vote.[8] A recognized expert on Constitutional matters, Senator Ervin believes the Fourteenth Amendment is adequate to insure the rights of women. In testimony before the House Committee on the Judiciary, Senator Ervin said that it was within the power of Congress to legislate changes to existing laws (he cited attendance at the service academies as one example), and that such individual legislative actions would be the most accurate reflection of the desires of the country.[9] This position is also supported by many eminent legal scholars, among them Professor Paul A. Freund of Harvard.[10] In spite of many convincing and scholarly arguments against passage of the amendment, the proponents have, thus far, carried the day.

There is little doubt that passage of the amendment

would open the doors of the Air Force Academy to women. For example, in a 1971 Congressional Hearing on equal rights for men and women, Representative Abner J. Mikva (Illinois) asked:

> Is it really that shocking or radical a notion to think that maybe women ought to be allowed into the service academies if they want to go? If we accept the notion that there are and ought to be women officers in our various branches of service, why should they not be allowed to go to the school of their choice in terms of the training they want to obtain for their service to their country?[11]

Dr. Bernice Sandler testified before the same committee on behalf of the Women's Equity Action League. She testified that, as a practical matter, not many women would choose the rigorous training; however, the option must be made available to them. Dr. Sandler said that our present laws prevent women from pursuing their objective regardless of their talent, skills, or desires simply because they were born female. Further:

> It is a loss to the Nation to forbid women, simply because of their reproductive organs, from sitting in the classrooms of West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy.
>
> This is what we ask: The opportunity to sit in the classroom and learn.[12]

Congresswoman Martha Griffiths (Michigan) is perhaps one of the most authoritative sources relative to the intent of the proposed amendment currently being considered

by the states. Congresswoman Griffiths was the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 208 which eventually passed both Houses of Congress and became the proposed Equal Rights Amendment. She has made it clear that attendance at the service academies would be required under the amendment.[13]

The opponents and proponents of the Equal Rights Amendment will continue to debate its merits, perhaps long after its final ratification. Nevertheless, it is the author's opinion that time and the egalitarian mood of America will serve the proponents of the amendment. Although passage of the amendment will most certainly open the doors of the Academy to women, there is presently legislation before Congress which could admit women to the Academy prior to approval of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Legislation Before Congress

In 1960, Morris Janowitz wrote in The Professional Soldier:

> Congressional contributions to military personnel policy have also frequently been essentially negative in overtone, or concerned with minor details. Congress has not extensively debated basic questions of the adequacy of the system of recruiting officers or the effectiveness of the Reserve Officer Training Corps training programs.[14]

This is no longer the case. Many recent Congressional Hearings, debates, and related documents show a growing sensitivity within the Congress to military personnel matters. This is largely due, no doubt, to the increasing costs associated with military personnel. In addition, many members of Congress are becoming more sensitive to the issue of female equal opportunity, and the exclusion of women from the service academies is receiving greater attention.

One of the central areas of debate concerns the adequacy of present statutes with respect to admitting women to the academies. In May 1973, Mr. Roger T. Kelley, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, sent a letter to Congressman F. Edward Hebert wherein Mr. Kelley stated that existing law was sufficient to permit women to enter the service academies. In part, his letter said:

> The power to appoint persons to the academies of the Army, Navy, and Air Force is a discretionary function of the President alone. This power of the Presid[illegible] is established by statute in 10 U.S.C. 4342 (d) (Army), 10 U.S.C. 9342 (d)(Air Force), and 10 U.S.C. 6953 (Navy). Since it is entirely within the discretion of the President to determine who will be appointed to a service academy, women could be appointed by him without the need for any new legislation.[15]

Mr. Kelley went on to point out that the general rule of construction in the United States Code regarding the use

of masculine gender is in 1 US Code 1. Under this rule, use of the masculine gender includes the feminine gender except where the context indicates otherwise.[16]

Mr. Kelley's interpretation of the law did not coincide with Congressman Hebert's view, and the Congressman so informed Mr. Kelley. In a letter to Assistant Secretary Kelley, Congressman Hebert said that it was never the intention of the House Committee on Armed Services to give the President the power to appoint women to the service academies. He further stated that ". . . the total context of the applicable statutes clearly indicates that only men are eligible for appointment to the academies and if any other course of action is planned, then the Executive Branch must come to the Congress for legislative authority."[17] The letter from Congressman Hebert to Mr. Kelley is a key element in the Air Force position relative to the issue of admitting women to the Academy, and a copy of the full text of the letter is included in Appendix A.[18]

As if in response to Congressman Hebert's challenge, legislation which would permit women to enter the service academies has been introduced in both Houses of the Congress.

In the House of Representatives, Congressman Pierre S. DuPont (Delaware), an outspoken critic of the practice

of excluding women from the academies, has introduced four bills to allow women to attend the service academies. He introduced his first bill (H.R. 10705) on 3 October 1973. Speaking to the House of Representatives, Congressman DuPont said that discrimination based on sex is wrong, particularly when it affects one's opportunity for employment. Further:

> If it takes amending the United States Code to open the academies to women, then let us change the laws. If it is really tradition that is stopping the admission of women, then I think we need to move the service academies into the 20th Century.[19]

He concluded by saying that it was ". . . ridiculous, wasteful, and anachronistic . . ." to exclude women from the best source of officer training.[20]

In general terms, the intent of Congressman DuPont's bill is "To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs."[21] A copy of the bill (H.R. 10705) is included as Appendix B.

As previously mentioned, Congressman DuPont has introduced four bills to admit women to the service academies; however, the bills are identical. The reason for this redundancy is that each bill is principally sponsored by Congressman DuPont, and each has a different group of co-sponsors.[22] Appendix C identifies the

four bills, the dates of submission, and the co-sponsors of each. [illegible] the All-Volunteer Force.[22] However, during the Each of Congressman DuPont's bills was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, under the chairmanship of Congressman Hebert; however, it is doubtful that the committee will take any action on the bills. This judgement is based on the tenor of Congressman Hebert's letter to Mr. Kelley (Appendix A) and an expression of Congressman Hebert's opposition to the idea of coeducational academies which was expressed by Mr. William H. Cook, Counsel to the Committee on Armed Services.[23] In addition, Major General Oliver W. Lewis, Director of Personnel Programs, Headquarters USAF, concurred with this assessment of the situation; however, General Lewis also pointed out that legislation relative to this issue had been introduced and passed in the Senate. Further, the Senate's legislation would be almost impossible for the House Committee on Armed Services to ignore.[24] The legislation is contained in Senate Bill S. 2771.

On 20 December 1973, the Senate took up debate on Bill S. 2771, "The Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act of 1974." The bill provides for expansion of the current enlistment bonus authority, currently used only for enlistments in the combat arms. The bill enjoys a high priority in the administration and

Department of Defense because passage would help promote the success of the All-Volunteer Force.[25] However, during the course of debate, Senator Hathaway (Maine) offered an amendment to the bill which would allow females to attend the service academies. His amendment reads in part:

> A female candidate for admission who is qualified to be trained in a skill or profession in which individuals of her sex are permitted to serve as commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States shall not be ineligible for admission on account of sex, nor shall sex be grounds for refusal of admission to the Academy.[26]

Senator Hathaway expressed his opinion that the amendment was in accord with the purpose of the bill because it would help to induce females to enter the service. Further, he stated that ". . . women are entitled to the same excellent officer training as men. And, of course, the best training available takes place at the military academies."[27] Senator John Stennis, floor manager of the bill, indicated he would like to see the matter tried out, and that he would be willing to take the amendment to conference or hold some hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee; however, Senators Thurmond, Mansfield, and Javits spoke out strongly in favor of the Hathaway amendment, and the Senate agreed to the amendment without further discussion.[28]

The bill, as amended by Senator Hathaway, was sent

to the House Committee on Armed Services. Because of the importance attached to the enlistment bonus features of the bill, Congressman Hebert's committee will probably hold hearings on the bill sometime in the spring of 1974.[29] Considering the growing number of Congressmen who favor female equality and who have lent their support to the movement to permit women to enter the service academies, it is the author's opinion that Senate Bill S. 2771, with the Hathaway amendment, has an even chance of becoming law. Of course, the ultimate outcome of this issue in Congress will depend on the behind the scenes maneuvering and the strengths of conviction of the proponents and opponents.

The Court Suit

If the Equal Rights Amendment should not be ratified by 38 states and if Congress fails to change the existing statutes, there is a third avenue by which women may gain the opportunity to attend the service academies: the federal court system.

On 26 September 1973, the Center for Women's Policy Studies, a national women's rights group, filed a class-action suit to force the Air Force and Naval Academies to admit women. The suit, filed in the United States District Court in Washington, D.C., charges that the

academies deprive women of one of the major entrance routes to becoming military officers and deprives them of opportunities critical to advancement within the armed forces. The suit names as plaintiffs two women and four California Congressmen who had unsuccessfully sponsored nominations of the women to the academies. The Congressmen are Jerome Waldie, Fortney Stark, Don Edwards, and Leo Ryan.[30]

It is expected that the Air Force will defend its policy of not admitting women to the Academy by pointing out that:

1. The policy is based on federal statutes.

2. The statutes express the will of Congress that the Academy should be open to men only.

3. If Congress wants to express a change of their will, they should revise the law.

4. Congress, not the Courts, should change admission rules.

This is virtually the same approach taken by the Department of Defense (DOD) in arguing for continuation of its policy of awarding servicewomen different financial entitlements than servicemen. The United States Supreme Court ruled eight-to-one against the DOD position and said that women and men should receive the same financial benefits.[31]

In December 1973, the plaintiffs in this suit

submitted, through the Court, a 170 question written interrogatory to the Air Force. The nature of the questions made it apparent that the plaintiffs' lawyers are attempting to establish a case showing that exclusion of women from the Academy is discriminatory. As a result of an extensive two-month search of computer data files at the Military Personnel Center, the Air Force was able to gather most of the information requested by the plaintiffs.[32]

It is expected that this suit will take some time to reach the hearing stage. Of course, this depends on the extent of the legal maneuvers and tactics employed by each side. However, should the Air Force lose this case in the District Court, it is expected to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court.[33]

Summary

This chapter has examined the three principal avenues by which the Air Force Academy could be forced to accept women cadets. The proposed Equal Rights Amendment will certainly cause the Air Force to change its policy, and the amendment requires ratification by only five more states. A second avenue of change is by Congressional action. Several bills have been introduced which would permit women to attend the Academy, and there is growing

pressure within the Congress to pass such legislation. Finally, a lawsuit is pending in the federal court system which challenges the Air Force policy of not admitting women to the Academy. Clearly, the Air Force should be prepared for the contingency that the Air Force Academy may soon become coeducational.

Before investigating Air Force policy and plans with respect to admitting women to the Academy, it is useful to consider the sociological aspects of a coeducational institution. Therefore, the next chapter deals with the primary sociological factors surrounding this issue.

CHAPTER IV

SOCIAL ATTITUDES AND EQUALITY

> For in our preoccupations with nations and peoples and races, let us remember again that there is a division still more basic than these in human suffering. It is the division of humanity into men and women.[1]

In order to evaluate the adequacy of the Air Force position regarding admission of females to the Academy, it is necessary to review the principal social aspects of the sex equality issue. In this chapter, the primary social factors which cause sex-based role differentiation are examined. In addition, the sociological implications of transitioning from an all-male to a coeducational institution of higher education are considered.

The Basis of Inequality

There are some who argue that traditional sex-based social functions can be attributed to fundamental biological differences between the sexes. The proponents of this view say that biological differences account for the fact that males normally carry the burden of certain social functions such as defense, police work, and high politics. Further, those who support this argument claim

that it would be biologically unnatural for women to assume any significant responsibility for these types of societal functions.[2]

On the other hand, there is a much larger school of thought which claims that sex-based role distinction is the product of cultural and social traditions. In 1963, the President's Commission on the Status of Women noted that socially imposed sex role distinctions have weakened our culture. The Commission reported that Americans have tended to differentiate between the appropriate values for men and women. For example, it has been appropriate for women to be concerned with community functions such as schools, libraries, and playgrounds. In addition, women were thought of as being concerned with the "finer" things in life; churchgoing, caring for people in trouble, and upholding the "moral fiber" of the society. Conversely, masculine values were viewed as products of the competitive world of business and politics, and these values ". . . appeared to be lower, more ruthless, and (in the case of politics) 'dirty'."[3] Likewise, in 1972, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future noted in their report that the movement of women into traditional "work roles" in place of motherhood was not yet socially accommodated in our society.[4] Ms. Jane Prather provides

a good explanation of this phenomenon by pointing out that work in America is defined in masculine terms. She also notes that socialization practices and patterns which form early in life are based on sex and the masculine definition of work.[5]

Some people look at our social concepts of the sexes and see feminine defined as simply the opposite of masculine; therefore, if males must be "masculine," and females "feminine," then certain values have been automatically imposed on each. In this manner, both sexes are ". . . constrained and are denied much of themselves as they are forced and force themselves to be only part human, only part of what they might otherwise be."[6] At least from the female's standpoint, there is merit in this argument.

It is well established that women often hold themselves back based on their preconceived ideas of what their career roles should be.[7] In the 1860's, John Stuart Mill recognized the preference of women for vocations in which there was nobody with which to compete. He noted, however, that women ". . . have proved themselves capable of everything, perhaps without a single exception, which is done by men, and of doing it successfully and creditably."[8] In 1970, Major General (then Colonel) Jeanne M. Holm noted the same pattern of

female behavior:

> One of the most formidable barriers to women's full participation in the many professional, creative, and managerial, and technical career fields is their own lack of confidence in themselves, collectively, as well as individually . . . self-doubt, self-depreciation, built-in prejudice about inherent inferiority of women relative to men in decisionmaking and leadership.[9]

There is abundant evidence suggesting that, if left to themselves, women will self-select into occupations consistent with their self-image and avoid traditionally masculine fields. This is because they have a tendency toward a negative self-image, and that self-image acts as a barrier to improvement in social status.[10] Furthermore, changes in the place of women in our society are made extremely difficult by the extensive interrelationships among social institutions within which sex role differentiation is embodied.[11]

One of our social institutions which has, until recently, maintained a high degree of sex role differentiation is the military. Within the military, the service academies retain a sex bias that, as pointed out in the preceding chapter, may be eliminated within the next few years. Considering this eventuality, it is useful to examine the social implications of a transition from an all-male to a coeducational institution.

Social Expectations of Coeducation

The debate over the merits of single-sex educational institutions versus coeducational institutions is certainly not a recent social concern. Over 180 years ago, Mary Wollstonecraft saw great benefits accruing to coeducation:

> Were boys and girls permitted to pursue the same studies together, those graceful decencies might early be inculcated which produce modesty without those sexual distinctions that taint the mind. Lessons of politeness, and that formulary of decorum, which treads on the heels of falsehood, would be rendered useless by habitual propriety of behaviour.[12]

Some modern day educators are equally unimpressed with the single-sex institutions. For example, Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, prominent authorities in the education field, have criticized the all-male institutions. They report that "Stag undergraduate institutions are prone to a kind of excess. Many are notable for athletic overemphasis and for a narrow Philestine pragmatism. . . ."[13] On the other hand, there is a considerable body of support for the retention of single-sex colleges.

The President of Westbrook College, Dr. James F. Dickinson, is quoted as saying ". . . that there should be some single-sex colleges to allow students a diversity

of choice for their college experience."[14] As another example, Dr. Marjorie B. Chambers, the Dean of all-female Mary Baldwin College, believes the best place to develop competence and self-confidence in women is in a women's college. Quite naturally, Dr. Chambers is firmly opposed to those who contend there is no justification for single-sex colleges.[15]

In the fall of 1970, Chatham College decided to counter what appeared to be a nationwide trend toward coeducation. Instead, it chose to remain a women's college while adjusting its curriculum to make it more relevant for the women and the society it served.[16] In the same vein, Dr. Matina S. Horner, on her installation as sixth President of Radcliffe College, praised Harvard and Radcliffe in the following terms:

> Our two institutions resisted the temptation to follow national trends or succumb to the pressures--political, financial and federal--for complete coeducation--total merger.[17]

For those opposed to coeducation, there is evidence to suggest that the mingling of sexes in an environment such as the classroom is a highly disruptive social arrangement.

Louis Kriesberg, a sociologist, believes the introduction of women into all-male institutions creates a setting for partisan and quarrelsome behavior between

the sexes.[18] Anthropologist Lionel Tiger blames the difficulty associated with introducing women into male groups on the physical sexual attraction that exists between the sexes.[19] This view is supported by American author George Gilder. In an article for National Review, he claims classrooms become sexual arenas where individuals perform for the attention of the opposite sex, and where males quickly come to view textbooks as a menace to manhood. He goes on to say that males will react to the presence of women in class in one of two ways:

> 1. They will put on a show for the females and dominate the class.
>
> 2. They will completely "drop-out" of the class in the face of female superiority.

In any event, Gilder believes that a classroom which contains both sexes performs an educational and social disservice to each.[20] Of course, many people see coeducation as an advantage to individual development.

Those who support coeducation do so for a variety of reasons. For example, William G. Caples, President of Kenyon College, stated that the original decision by Kenyon College to admit females was based on the belief that ". . . women would bring academic balance to the classroom and a vital balance to the total life of Kenyon College."[21]

Messrs. Jencks and Riesman recognize the possibility of a negative response by men to the presence of women on a campus; however, they see this response as an outgrowth of coeducational elementary and secondary schools, of predominantly female teachers at those levels, and of American culture in general. They argue that this negative male reaction to competition with women is far more likely to be overcome in coeducational than in all-male colleges:

> In mixed colleges the boys are most likely to learn that their attractiveness to girls is not really dependent on being radically different from them, but rather the reverse. This reassures them about exploring seemingly "feminine" behavior like doing assignments, getting excited about books, and developing aesthetic sensitivity. Such reassurance is probably harder to come by if girls are seen only on weekends and never in academic or extracurricular settings.[22]

In addition, Jencks and Riesman are of the opinion that the mere presence of girls in the classroom generates a more responsive audience for the instructor than would be the case if all the students were men.[23]

The arguments of Jencks and Riesman seem to be borne out in a study conducted in 1972 of 62 male seniors at an unnamed Ivy League college. The study was performed to measure some of the social consequences of introducing women to the previously all-male campus. The results

reflected a change in male role definitions and a lessening of male anxiety and stress in relations with females as a result of the newly acquired female student population:

> . . . the normative expectation of male intellectual superiority appears to be giving way on the campus of our study to the idea of intellectual companionship between equals.[24]

These results would support the argument of those who favor a coeducational Air Force Academy; however, there are some preparatory considerations which should be recognized.

Preparing For the Transition

Before women are introduced to an all-male institution such as the Air Force Academy, there are two important considerations which must be borne in mind. First, the institution should provide female role models for the women students. For example, the first class of female students to attend Kenyon College stressed the value of the presence of the female Dean of Women, because it gave them someone with whom they could identify.[25] In addition, it is important to have adequate numbers of females on the faculty. An insufficient number of women instructors may be viewed as discriminating against female students because it deprives them of professional

role models.[26] Another benefit of having several women on the faculty is that they help to dispel the traditional male image of harsh discipline, and thereby reduce the sex role conflicts that women experience in predominantly male classrooms.[27]

The second consideration which must not be overlooked when introducing women into male educational institutions is the attitudes of faculty and peers. Changes in attitudes are difficult to achieve; however, such attitudinal modification is necessary if women are to achieve educational parity.[28] In a study of male manager's attitudes toward females, sociologist Bernard Bass and his associates concludes that men and women must be put in situations where they can interact as equals. By permitting and encouraging interaction as equals, men and women come to recognize that their goals and values overlap, and this contributes to a positive attitudinal modification by members of each sex.[29] This concept can be legitimately extrapolated to the school environment where policies must encourage male and female interaction on an equal basis; however, one warning is in order. Those who establish the policies must exercise extreme caution to avoid introducing discriminatory bias into their policy decisions.

Summary

Although some see traditional sex-based social functions as products of human biological differences, there is much wider support for the theory that sex-based role distinction is the result of cultural and social traditions. Single-sex colleges are one of the social institutions often accused of perpetuating traditional sex roles; however, there are arguments to support both single-sex and coeducational arrangements. Nevertheless, should the Air Force be directed to transition the Air Force Academy to a coeducational institution, consideration must be given to the following: (1) providing female role models for the women cadets, and (2) conditioning the attitudes of the faculty and of the male cadets.

Having examined the social basis of sex role differentiation and the social implications of coeducation, the following chapter will appraise the Air Force position relative to admitting women to the Academy.

CHAPTER V

THE AIR FORCE POSITION

> The military is not only the nation's largest bureaucracy, but it is probably the most entrenched, and the least amenable to confrontation or to change.[1]

This observation was made by Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky in his book The Military Establishment. Perhaps this criticism is justified with respect to issues of fundamental doctrine; however, it is not justified in terms of the military response to the egalitarian mood of the nation. On the contrary, the military establishment in general, and the Air Force in particular, must be considered among the leading exponents of equal opportunity.

The Air Force Trend

One need only page through issues of the Air Force Times for the past two or three years to see the results of the Air Force equal opportunity program. Headlines signaling increased recruitment of black officers, new Reserve Officer Training Corps units at black colleges, acceptance of the first female chaplain, and many others testify to the breadth of effort taken by the Air Force to make equal opportunity a reality.

Secretary of the Air Force John L. McLucas spoke of the Air Force commitment to equal opportunity in a September 1973 speech to the Channel City Club of Santa Barbara, California:

> We're committed to a program of equal opportunity. We not only have stated this as an objective, but we're taking many actions to make it a reality by bringing our career opportunities to the attention of minority groups outside the service.[2]

With respect to women, he said:

> Many of you know that we have a fairly aggressive program for recruiting and training women. In our ROTC program, for example, we are training a couple of thousand young people to be lieutenants in the Air Force. Similarly, we're increasing the number of recruits from the current strength of 19,000 women in the Air Force to 48,000 - which we expect to achieve in a period of 5 years. This is a very rapid build-up. And we are doing it because we find these women can do the work, they like the Air Force, and we think that bringing them in results in a better Air Force.[3]

In testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, Major General Oliver W. Lewis told the committee that the Air Force is ". . . determined to break with the past to insure that the utilization of women is not dictated by tradition."[4] Indeed, all career fields, except those which are combat oriented, are now open to women on a worldwide basis. Mr. Richard J. Borda, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve

Affairs, told the House Committee on Armed Services that enlisted women can now enter 98 percent of the Air Force career specialties, and female officers are eligible for 92 percent of the officer specialties.[5] These are significant steps in the direction of equal opportunity for women; however, the Air Force is criticized by some for not extending its equal opportunity policy to permit women to enter the Academy.

Air Force Policy on Female Cadets

The Air Force policy on the issue of admitting women to the Air Force Academy is very explicit. That position is found in testimony delivered to the House Committee on Armed Services by Secretary Borda:

> Mr. Cook (Counsel to the committee). What is your position with regard to women entering the Air Force Academy?
>
> Secretary Borda. Well, it is our understanding it is not the sense of Congress that women be in the service academies. Until such time, of course, as Congress has that "sense" we do not intend to enroll women in the Air Force Academy.[6]

In later testimony, Mr. Cook asked General Lewis if he considered that women should be admitted to the Academy. General Lewis replied that ". . . our position is that when it is the will of Congress to do so, we will do so."[7]

In addition, the relevance of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the issue of admitting women

to the Academy is recognized by the Air Force.[8] Regardless of the avenue by which the "will of Congress" is articulated; be it through ratification of the ERA, passage of specific legislation, or judicial interpretation of existing legislation, the Air Force has prepared a comprehensive plan for making the transition to a coeducational Air Force Academy.

The Air Force Academy Plan

On 24 June 1972, the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel issued a letter containing general planning guidance for the possible admission of women to the Air Force Academy.[9] The timing of the letter suggests that it was probably in response to Congressional passage of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment in March 1972. In any event, the Air Force Academy published a plan which outlined the detailed actions necessary to make the transition to a coeducational institution. This first plan, USAFA OPLAN 36-72, was published with an effective date of 15 September 1972. The plan, in the traditional Air Force operations plan format, included the tasks to be accomplished by affected Academy staff agencies and other support activities. For example, the plan addressed curriculum and athletic program modifications, facilities alterations, and changes to the Office of

Admissions and Registrar Program. In addition to general policy guidelines, the plan contained many specific details such as the need for beautician services, latrine modifications, and a section on female participation in varsity sports competition.[10] The original plan was revised in December 1973; however, the revised plan differs only slightly from the original. In the following discussion, the most important and constant elements of Academy planning and the significant differences between the two plans are considered.

Academy planning for admitting women is divided into three phases. Phase I is called "preparation," and includes the development of plans and policies necessary to outline the known changes which must be made to the existing Academy program in order to admit female cadets. Phase II, "transition," begins with the decision to admit women and includes modification of facilities, ordering supplies, publishing changes to directives, and other specific actions necessary to change from the existing program to the coeducational program. The third phase is called "execution" and begins when the first female cadets arrive, and the programs developed during Phase I and Phase II are implemented.[11]

A minimum period of 18 months between Phase II and Phase III has been established in order to accomplish

recruiting programs, testing of candidates, and selection of candidates for admittance. In addition, an 18 month lead time is considered necessary in order to select, requisition, and train junior female officers to serve as surrogate upperclasswomen for the first two years--until a female upperclass is generated.[12]

The Air Force Academy takes a very positive approach toward integrating females into the Cadet Wing.

> Female candidates will initially be assigned to separate female unit (s) and participate in all classes, training, and programs normally conducted for male cadets with the exception of those portions exceeding their strength capabilities. Suitable substitute training will be provided. Optional training programs oriented toward the preparation of combat officers will not be offered to females. Considerations will be given to integrated billeting within and assignment to the existing cadet squadrons when female cadet numbers and experience dictates.[13]

Further, the plan calls for three women officers on the Commandant of Cadets Staff, one junior female officer per ten female cadets to act as surrogate upperclasswomen, a contingent of female physical education instructors, and it recognizes the need for female officers on the faculty.[14] Finally, necessary facilities modifications to the dormitory, gymnasium, and academic building are estimated to cost under $25,000 and could be accomplished in less than six months.[15]

Publication of the first plan initiated Phase I. In the author's view, this plan set an outstanding precedent and showed a very "enlightened" approach to the problem. The lack of bias and negativism has carried over into the first revision of the plan. On 10 December 1973, the original plan was revised and redesignated as USAFA OPLAN 7-73. The revised plan is virtually identical to the first plan; however, there are some changes worth noting.

One area of change involves the number of females which the Academy considers an acceptable class size. The original plan indicated that 44 female cadets was the acceptable minimum in a class. In addition, the first plan assumed that the maximum initial input would be 100-150 females.[16] The revised plan increased the minimum acceptable initial input to 150 women; however, the new plan reflected no significant change in related support requirements, nor did it offer an explanation for this relatively major increase.[17] Both plans specify that the minimum acceptable number of females is based on studies which indicate that females in a military training environment must have a sizable group with which to identify. In each plan, the number was considered the minimum essential for effective training, unique command and control problems, and general economic considerations.[18]

It must, therefore, be assumed that the original estimate was based on an incomplete analysis of the factors bearing on the problem. Nevertheless, Major General Lewis indicated in an interview that there is flexibility in the revised number, and the final determination will depend on a myriad of considerations.[19]

The revised plan also expanded the section dealing with the Office of Admissions and Registrar Program. The revised plan indicates a genuine effort is underway to deal with the difficult problem of equalizing admission standards between the sexes. For example, standards related to nonacademic and leadership achievement are under study because of the limited athletic activities available to female high school students.[20]

A third change which carries some significance is the wording of one assumption used in formulating the plans. The original plan made the following assumption: "Females will be admitted to the Cadet Wing at some future date."[21] That assumption has been modified in the revised plan to read: "Females could possibly be admitted into the Cadet Wing at some future date."[22] The revised assumption is clearly less definitive or certain of the future than was the original assumption, and it appears to reflect a subtle shift in the Air Force position relative to admission of females to the Academy.

The shift in position is further reflected in the officially designated responses to media queries. In the original plan, the public affairs annex contained an official response to media questions concerning the Academy's preparations to accept women. The response was:

> The Equal Rights Amendment, if ratified by 38 states, will become effective two years thereafter. Ratification of this Amendment could ultimately make females eligible to apply for service academies. Accordingly, the Air Force Academy is making plans to meet this contingency.[23]

However, in the revised plan, the ascendance of the concept of adhering to the "will of Congress" is clear. In the revised plan, the official response to a media query on why the Academy does not accept women makes this point evident:

> In replies to queries from members of Congress on this subject, we have pointed out that the Air Force Academy has done some planning for the contingency that women might be entered into the service academies at a future date. However, in the same context, we have emphasized that it is not our intention to enroll women until such time that this is clearly the will of Congress. Although the Congress has stated its position on the equal rights amendment, it is not clear that the Congress intended the same position to apply to the specific question of admission of women to the service academies. We are convinced that should women be admitted, it must not be a token effort. To enter one, two, or any similarly small number would create a difficult situation for the Academy and for the young women involved. Since approximately 85% of each Academy class enters as a result of Congressional nominations, we

consider Congressional support for such an eventuality to be essential.[24]

Considering the opposition to admitting women to the service academies expressed by some very influential Congressmen, especially Congressman Hebert, the shift in policy is understandable. Congressman Hebert has made his position very clear, and in the author's opinion, the Air Force is simply adjusting to political realities and the influence of powerful Congressmen.

In spite of the political sensitivity of the issue, the Air Force has developed and retains a sound plan for accepting women in the Academy. In addition, there is enough flexibility in Air Force policy to allow for compression of lead times and modification of class size limits should conditions warrant.[25]

Summary

Although the Air Force has a broad ranging equal opportunity program, it does not permit women to attend the Air Force Academy. Air Force officials base this policy on the fact that it is not yet the "will of Congress" for the Academy to be coeducational. However, the possibility of women entering the Academy at some future date has been under active consideration by the Air Force since early 1972. Consequently, the Air Force has developed a flexible and politically responsive

position regarding the integration of women into the Cadet Wing. Regardless of the future course of events, the Air Force Academy is armed with a plan for transitioning to a coeducational institution.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Since the early 1960's, the nation has witnessed a major reemergence of the women's movement with a concomitant increase in emotional intensity regarding the issue of equal rights for women. One area of equal rights and equal opportunity from which women see themselves excluded is attendance at the service academies; however, this practice is presently under attack in Congress and in the federal court system. In addition, ratification of the proposed Equal Rights Amendment could, in itself, strike down this bit of sex discrimination. Therefore, it can be concluded that the time is rapidly approaching when social pressure to admit females to the Air Force Academy will overcome Air Force traditions and policies against that action.

As a second conclusion, it is clear that Air Force planning for accepting female cadets has been developed with sufficient consideration and understanding of the potential social problems associated with becoming coeducational. The Air Force Academy plan calls for

including women on the staff and faculty so as to provide female cadets with professional role models. In addition, the Academy plan recognizes the importance of placing male and female cadets in situations where they can interact as equals. Consequently, the transition to a coeducational institution should be made with little adverse impact on the student body or on the institution itself.

Recommendations

The author believes there are actions which can be taken by the Air Force Academy to improve its overall preparation for the transition to a coeducational school.

First, it is recommended that the Academy immediately begin to select and assign an increased number of female officers to graduate school in preparation for faculty positions. The Academy program for admitting women recognizes the need for female officers on the faculty; however, as of December 1973, there were only three female faculty members.[1] Considering that desired female enrollment is 150 women per class, greater numbers of female faculty will be necessary. In order to avoid criticism and unnecessary last minute personal hardships, the Academy should start to increase the size of its female faculty.

A related recommendation concerns the optimum ratio, by sex, of faculty to students in a coeducational institution. The author found no documentation concerning the desired or forecast ratio of female faculty to female cadets. This subject should be carefully considered, and it is recommended as a topic for future research.

A third recommendation concerns the attitudinal preparation of cadets, staff, and faculty for the admission of women. Potential social, psychological, and other problems should be brought to the attention of these target groups. In addition, action programs to achieve the necessary attitudinal adjustments within these target groups should be developed and implemented. Such activity will serve to smooth the assimilatory process by which women will become accepted members of the organization.

Finally, in the course of preparing this research study, several topics for additional research were noted. One of the most potentially sensitive issues that will face the Air Force Academy after women are accepted as cadets will involve Air Force policy on birth control for female cadets. Difficult policy decisions will have to be made relative to issuing birth control devices to female cadets and the provision of abortion services to those female cadets who so desire. In addition, the Air Force must develop a defensible policy on the proper

course of action should a pregnant female cadet choose to deliver her child. These are legally, morally, and socially complex issues, and the Air Force should begin to prepare for their occurrence. These issues are well within the scope of research material available in the Air University Library, and they are recommended as possible research topics for Air University students.

Concluding Statement

The Air Force policy regarding admission of women to the Academy rests on a sound and viable foundation. By adapting to the will of Congress, the Air Force has placed itself in the position of being a politically neutral exponent of admitting women to the Academy; however, the Air Force's forthright and unbiased planning for making the change must be judged as a socially sensitive and positive act. As a consequence, the Air Force has achieved a flexible position wherein it can make a suitable response to any changes in the legal, political, or social aspects of the issue.

FOOTNOTES

Chapter I

1. John Stuart Mill, "The Subjection of Women," in The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women, ed. G. E. G. Catlin (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929), p. 220.

2. Conrad M. Arensberg and Arthur H. Niehoff, Introducing Social Change (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1964), p. 179. Also, Helen B. Shaffer, "Women's Consciousness Raising," Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 2 (5 July 1973), p. 499; and, Louis Kriesberg, The Sociology of Social Conflicts (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. xi.

3. For example, see Nancy Goldman, "The Utilization of Women in the Military," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 406 (March 1973), p. 108.

4. Ibid., p. 110.

5. Adam Yarmolinsky, The Military Establishment (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 406.

6. United States Air Force Academy Operations Plan Number 7-73 (10 December 1973), p. 2.

7. "Women's Rights and Women's Lib," Editorial, Christian Science Monitor, 16 April 1973, p. 15 (hereafter cited as "Women's Rights and Women's Lib").

8. Jo Freeman, "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), pp. 795-96. Also see Diana Loercher, "Barricades are but Part of the Story," Christian Science Monitor, 4 April 1973, p. 15; and "Women's Rights and Women's Lib," p. 15.

Chapter II

1. Mary Wollstonecraft, "Vindication of the Rights of Women," in The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women, ed. G. E. G. Catlin (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929), p. 220.

2. Page Smith, Daughters of the Promised Land (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970), p. 96. Pages 103-129 of this book contain an excellent synopsis of the early development of the women's movement. Also see Caroline Bird, Born Female: The High Cost of Keeping Women Down (New York: David McKay Co., 1968), pp. 20-37.

3. Bird, Born Female, p. 28.

4. Kate Millett, Sexual Politics (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1970), p. 80. Ms. Millett identifies Sarah and Angelina Grimke, Lucy Stone, Lucretia Mott, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton as the dominant leaders in the early years of the movement.

5. Smith, Daughters, p. 163.

6. Nan Trent, "19th-Century Feminists Would Have Cheered," Christian Science Monitor, 2 April 1973, p. 9.

7. Millett, Sexual Politics, p. 92.

8. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1968), pp. 291-92.

9. Ian Weinberg, "Social Problems That Are No More," in Handbook on the Study of Social Problems, ed. Erwin O. Smigel (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971), p. 64.

10. Bird, Born Female, pp. 23-25.

11. Trent, "19th-Century Feminists," p. 9.

12. Ibid.

13. Millett, Sexual Politics, p. 157. Ms. Millett claims that our society, like all other societies in history, is a patriarchy or male dominated society. The main institution of the patriarchy is the family. For further details on this concept, see pages 25-31 of Ms. Millett's book.

14. U. S., Congress, Senate, Senator Bayh's submission of excerpts from the majority report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the Equal Rights Amendment, 92d Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 118, No. 44 (22 March 1972), p. S4582.

15. Pearl S. Buck, Of Men and Women (New York: John Day Co., 1941), p. 5.

16. J. D. Dunn and Elvis C. Stephens, Management of Personnel: Manpower Management and Organizational Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972), p. 9.

17. Margaret Mead and Frances Balgley Kaplan, American Women, Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women and Other Publications of the Commission, 11 October 1963 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 87. A good historical review of women's role in the U. S. military from the Revolutionary War to the Viet Nam War can be found in Grover Heiman Jr., and Virginia Heiman Meyers, Careers for Women in Uniform (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971), pp. 13-24.

18. For example, see Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963), p. 103. Also, Dunn and Stephens, Management of Personnel, p. 162.

19. Jo Freeman, "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), pp. 797-98.

20. The report of the Commission has been published. See citation in footnote 17 above.

21. Ms. Friedan's book sold over one million copies, and many people credit the book as being the single most important factor in the revival of the feminist movement. For example, Kirsten Amundsen, The Silenced Majority: Women and American Democracy (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971), pp. 5-6. Also, Trent, "19th-Century Feminists," p. 9.

22. The addition of the word "sex" to the language of the Congressional bill was considered a joke by many members of Congress. An excellent summary of the events in Congress related to the addition of the word can be found in Bird, Born Female, pp. 1-9.

23. Seymour M. Farber and Roger H. L. Wilson, eds., The Potential of Women (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), p. vii. This book is the product of the third in a series of symposia called "Man and Civilization." This symposium, held in January 1963, took a rather clinical view of women's equality, and this book is less emotionally inspiring than most of the feminist lieterature.

24. Friedan, Feminine Mystique, p. 32.

25. Diana Loercher, "Barricades are but Part of the Story," Christian Science Monitor, 4 April 1973, p. 15. Also see Freeman, Origins, pp. 797-98.

26. Freeman, Origins, p. 804.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid., pp. 802-805.

29. Ibid., p. 806.

30. Amundsen, Silenced Majority, pp. 1-184.

31. S. M. Miller, Pamela A. Roby, and Daphne Joslin, "Social Issues of the Future," in Handbook on the Study of Social Problems, ed. Erwin O. Smigel (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971), p. 683.

32. Loercher, "Barricades," p. 15.

33. "For the Record," National Review, 26 October 1973, p. 1150.

34. Betty Friedan, "Human . . . Not Class!" Social Policy, Vol. 3 (March/April 1973), p. 32.

35. Ibid., p. 37.

36. "Official Sees 'Second Wave of Feminism'," Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

37. U. S., Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Escalation in Defense Procurement Contracts and Military Posture and H. R. 6722, Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 2244. Also, Andrew Tully, "Capital Fare," Montgomery Advertiser and Alabama Journal, 6 January 1974, p. 4A.

38. Elaine Colonnelli, "LA Woman Aided Launch of Movement's 2nd Wave," Montgomery (Alabama) Advertiser, 26 December 1973, p. 16.

39. There are several good historical summaries of the women's movement in the United States. The author considers the following among the best: Friedan, Feminine Mystique, pp. 80-102, and Millett, Sexual Politics, pp. 61-233. The history of the movement in other countries can be found in Sheila Rowbotham, Women, Resistance, and Revolution: A History of Women and Revolution in the Modern World (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972).

Chapter III

1. William Leavitt, "Air Force Academy: A Time of Transition," Air Force, October 1973, p. 31.

2. U. S., Congress, Senate, Senator Bayh's submission of excerpts from the majority report of The Committee on the Judiciary on the Equal Rights Amendment, 92d Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 118, No. 44 (22 March 1972), pp. S4582-83. The results of the roll call vote are on page S4612.

3. U.S. Code: Congressional and Administrative News, No. 4 (15 May 1973), p. 779.

4. Ibid.

5. "Ohio Ratifies ERA," Christian Science Monitor, 8 February 1974, p. 8; and NBC, "Today," 25 February 1974, Newscast, Barbara Walters. There has been a recent growth of opposition to the amendment, and the League of Women Voters organized a nationwide fund raising campaign to counter a ". . . well-heeled conservative campaign of fear against the amendment." See "League of Women Voters Starts Equal Rights Drive," New York Times, 12 October 1973, p. 46. Also, Andrew Tully, "Capital Fare," Montgomery Advertiser and Alabama Journal, 6 January 1974, p. 4A.

6. "Controversy Over the 'Equal Rights For Women' Amendment," Congressional Digest, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1971), p. 1. Also, U.S., Congress, Senate, "Equal Rights for Men and Women," 92d Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 118, No. 44 (22 March 1972), pp. S4531-4613.

7. Margaret Mead and Frances Balgley Kaplan, American Women, Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women and Other Publications of the Commission, 11 October 1963 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 66, 148.

8. U.S., Congress, Senate, "Equal Rights for Men and Women," 92d Cong., 2d sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 118, No. 44 (22 March 1972), pp. S4531-4613.

9. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on The Judiciary, Equal Rights for Men and Women 1971, Hearings before Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Committee on The Judiciary. 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971, pp. 54-84.

10. "Controversy Over the 'Equal Rights For Women' Amendment," Congressional Digest, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1971), p. 25.

11. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on the Judiciary, Equal Rights 1971, Hearings, p. 86.

12. Ibid., p. 275.

13. Ibid., pp. 6-7, 50.

14. Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960), p. 356.

15. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Cost Escalation in Defense Procurement Contracts and Military Posture and H.R. 6722, Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 2307.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid.

18. Major General Oliver W. Lewis, Headquarters USAF, Director of Personnel Programs; interview held after his lecture at the Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 25 January 1974.

19. U.S., Congress, House, "Women in Military Academies," 93d Cong., 1st sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 147 (3 October 1973), p. H8615.

20. Ibid.

21. U.S., Congress, House, A Bill to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall be Made Without Regard to a Candidate's Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs, H.R. 10705, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, pp. 1-3.

22. Captain Ronald L. Morey, Action Officer, Headquarters USAF, Directorate of Personnel Programs; telephone interview held on 12 February 1974.

23. U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Cost Escalation, Hearings, p. 2601

24. Major General Lewis, interview, 25 January 1974.

25. U.S., Congress, Senate, "Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act," 93d Cong., 1st sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 201 (20 December 1973), p. S23608. Also, interview with Major General Lewis on 25 January 1974.

26. U.S., Congress, Senate, An Act to Amend Chapter 5 of Title 37, United States Code, to revise the Special Pay Bonus Relating to Members of the Armed Forces, and for Other Purposes, S.2771, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, pp. 5-6.

27. U.S., Congress, Senate, "Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act," 93d Cong., 1st sess., Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 201 (20 December 1973), p. S23607.

28. Ibid., pp. S23607-23608.

29. Captain Morey, telephone interview on 12 February 1974.

30. "Women Sue Service Academies," Washington Post, 17 September 1973, p. A34. Also, "Academies Face Suit," New York Times, 30 September 1973, sec. 1, p. 76.

31. George Foster, "'Men Only' Academy Fight Nears," Air Force Times, 2 January 1974, p. 13.

32. Captain Morey, telephone interview on 12 February 1974.

33. Ibid.

Chapter IV

1. Pearl S. Buck, Of Men and Women (New York: John Day Co., 1941), p. 202.

2. Lionel Tiger, Men in Groups (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 86.

3. Margaret Mead and Frances Balgley Kaplan, American Women, Report of the President's Commission on the Status of Women and Other Publications of the Commission, 11 October 1963 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), p. 196.

4. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Report of the Commission, Population and the American Future (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), p. 92.

5. Jane Prather, "Why Can't Women be More Like Men," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), p. 172.

6. Louis Kriesberg, The Sociology of Social Conflicts (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 29.

7. C. F. Fretz and Joanne Hayman, "Progress for Women--Men are Still More Equal," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 51 (September/October 1973), p. 135.

8. John Stuart Mill, "The Subjection of Women," in The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women, ed. G. E. G. Catlin (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929), p. 267.

9. Colonel Jeanne M. Holm, "Women and Future Manpower Needs," Defense Management Journal, Vol. 6 (Winter 1970), pp. 10-11.

10. John DeLamater and Linda S. Fidell, "On the Status of Women," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), p. 170.

11. Kriesberg, Sociology, p. 239.

12. Mary Wollstonecraft, "Vindication of the Rights of Women," in The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women, ed. G. E. G. Catlin (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929), p. 183.

13. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1968), p. 300.

14. T. Stuart Infantine, "Girls' School Goes Coed," Christian Science Monitor, 10 February 1973, p. 14.

15. "Women's Colleges Defended," Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

16. "Official Sees 'Second Wave of Feminism'," Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

17. Matina S. Horner, "Opportunity For Educational Innovation," in Representative American Speeches: 1972-1973, ed. Waldo W. Braden (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1973), p. 191.

18. Kriesberg, Sociology, p. 32.

19. Tiger, Men in Groups, p. 215.

20. George Gilder, "On Rediscovering the Difference," National Review, 3 August 1973, pp. 832-33.

21. Robert Zuer, "And Then There Were Women. . . ," Christian Science Monitor, 10 February 1973, p. 14.

22. Jencks and Riesman, Academic Revolution, p. 302.

23. Ibid., p. 301.

24. Mirra Komarovsky, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), p. 884.

25. Zuer, "There Were Women," p. 14.

26. S. M. Miller, Pamela A. Roby, and Daphne Joslin, "Social Issues of the Future," in Handbook on the Study of Social Problems, ed. Erwin O. Smigel (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971), p. 682.

27. Joyce M. Mitchell and Rachel R. Stan[illegible], "Recruitment of Academie Women," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), p. 188.

28. DeLamater and Fidell, "Status of Women," p. 170.

29. Bernard Bass, Judith Krusell, and Ralph A. Alexander, "Male Manager's Attitudes Toward Working Women," American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), p. 235.

Chapter V

1. Adam Yarmolinsky, The Military Establishment (New York: Harper & Row, 1971), p. 406.

2. John L. McLucas, "Achieving an Effective Air Force in Peacetime," Supplement to the Air Force Policy Letter for Commanders, AFRP 190-2, No. 12-1973 (December 1973), p. 14.

3. Ibid., p. 13.

4. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Appropriations, Department of Defense Appropriations for 1974, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the House Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 1178.

5. U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Armed Services, Cost Escalation in Defense Procurement Contracts and Military Posture and H.R. 6722, Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973, p. 2255.

6. Ibid., p. 2306.

7. Ibid., p. 2601.

8. United States Air Force Academy Operations Plan Number 7-73 (10 December 1973), pp. 11 and I-I-1 (hereafter cited as OPLAN 7-73). Also, United States Air Force Academy Operations Plan Number 36-72 (15 September 1972), pp. 11 and I-I-1 (hereafter cited as OPLAN 36-72).

9. OPLAN 36-72, p. 1.

10. OPLAN 36-72, pp. 1 thru I-I-1.

11. Ibid., pp. A-3, A-4.

12. OPLAN 36-72, pp. A-1, B-1; and OPLAN 7-73, pp. A-1, B-1.

13. OPLAN 36-72, p. B-1; and OPLAN 7-73, p. B-1.

14. OPLAN 36-72, pp. B-2, D-II-1, E-1; and OPLAN 7-73, pp. B-2, D-II-1, E-1.

15. OPLAN 36-72, p. G-I-1; and OPLAN 7-73, p. G-I-1.

16. OPLAN 36-72, pp. 4, A-2.

17. OPLAN 7-73, pp. 4, A-2.

18. OPLAN 36-72, p. A-2; and OPLAN 7-73, p. A-2.

19. Major General Oliver W. Lewis, Headquarters USAF, Director of Personnel Programs; interview held after his lecture at the Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 25 January 1974.

20. OPLAN 7-73, p. C-1.

21. OPLAN 36-72, p. 4.

22. OPLAN 7-73, p. 4.

23. OPLAN 36-72, p. I-I-1.

24. OPLAN 7-73, p. I-I-1.

25. Major General Lewis, interview, 25 January 1974.

Chapter VI

1. Cadet Third Class Joseph Shirey, Cadet, USAF Academy; interview held at Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 4 January 1974.

APPENDIX A

CONGRESSMAN HEBERT'S LETTER

U.S. House of Representatives,
Committee on Armed Services
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1973.

Mr. Roger T. Kelley,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelley: This will acknowledge your letter of May 18, 1973, with regard to the sufficiency of present law to allow for the appointment of women to the service academies. In essence, you state that only where the provision for appointment of "sons" is contained in the law would the appointment of women be prohibited. I must disagree, the provisions of 1 USC 1 not withstanding.

From my long experience in this committee, I can state unequivocally that it was never our intention to give the President power to appoint women to the service academies. Indeed, the very use of the word "sons" in the statutes clearly indicates the overall intent when these matters were before Congress. Further, we consistently used the word "he" and "his" in its "usual meaning," and not embracing the feminine gender.

Accordingly, I submit that the total context of the applicable statutes clearly indicates that only men are eligible for appointment to the academies and if any other course is planned, then the Executive Branch must come to the Congress for legislative authority. I am sending copies of this correspondence to the respective service secretaries for their information.

Sincerely,

F. Edw. Hebert.
Chairman.

APPENDIX B

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 10705

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 3, 1973

Mr. DU PONT introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 403 of title 10 of the United States Code (relating to the Army Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 4346 the following new subsection:

"(c) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 4342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(b) Chapter 603 of such title (relating to the Naval Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 6958 the following new subsection:

"(d) Admission to the Academy shall be made solely on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and (c) of section 6954, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

(c) Chapter 903 of such title (relating to the Air Force Academy) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 9346 the following new subsection:

"(e) Admission to the Academy shall be made on the basis of requirements contained in this section and without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of a candidate."; and

(2) in subsections (a) (1), (a) (8), (b) (1), and

(c) of section 9342, by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting "sons and daughters" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 182 (a) of title 14 of the United States Code (relating to admission to the Coast Guard Academy) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following new sentence: "All such appointments shall be made without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of the applicants.".

SEC. 3. Section 216 (b) (1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1126 (b) (1), relating to admission to the Merchant Marine Academy) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "Appointments from each State shall be made" where it appears in the penultimate sentence the following: "without regard to the sex, race, color, or religious beliefs of candidates";

(2) by striking out "sons" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "sons and daughters".

SEC. 4. Section 901 (a) of the Education Amendments of 1972 (86 Stat. 373; 20 U.S.C. 1861 (a), relating to prohibition of sex discrimination and exceptions thereto) is amended by striking out paragraph (4) and redesignating paragraph (5), and any reference thereto, as paragraph (4).

APPENDIX C

CONGRESSMAN DUPONT'S BILLS

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 10705

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

By Mr. DU PONT

OCTOBER 3, 1973
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11267

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

By Mr. DU PONT, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BELL, Ms. BURKE of California, Ms. CHISHOLM, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FASCELL, Ms. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HOGAN, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Ms. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LENT, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHROEDER, and Mr. SEIBERLING

NOVEMBER 6, 1973
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11268

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

By Mr. DU PONT, Mr. STARK, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. THONE, Mr. WARE, and Mr. WON PAT

NOVEMBER 6, 1973
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

93D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11711

A BILL

To insure that each admission to the service academies shall be made without regard to a candidate's sex, race, color, or religious beliefs.

By Mr. DU PONT, Mr. BIESTER, and Mr. RYAN

NOVEMBER 30, 1973
Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Amundsen, Kirsten. The Silenced Majority: Women and American Democracy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

Arensberg, Conrad M., and Arthur H. Niehoff. Introducing Social Change. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1964.

Bird, Caroline. Born Female: The High Cost of Keeping Women Down. New York: David McKay Co., 1968.

Buck, Pearl S. Of Men and Women. New York: John Day Co., 1941.

Dunn, J. D., and Elvis C. Stephens. Management of Personnel: Manpower Management and Organizational Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. Woman's Place. Berkeley, CA.: University of California Press, 1971.

Farber, Seymour M., and Roger H. L. Wilson, eds. The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1963.

Ginzberg, Eli. Life Styles of Educated Women. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.

Heiman, Grover, and Virginia Heiman Myers. Careers for Women in Uniform. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1971.

Horner, Matina S., Dr. "Opportunity for Educational Innovation." Representative American Speeches: 1972-1973. Edited by Waldo W. Braden. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1973.

Huntington, Samuel P. The Soldier and The State. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Janeway, Elizabeth. Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology. New York: William Morrow & Co., 1971.

Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Kraditor, Aileen. Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968.

Kriesberg, Louis. The Sociology of Social Conflicts. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Mead, Margaret, and Frances Balgley Kaplan, eds. American Women. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

Mill, John Stuart. "The Subjection of Women." In The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women. Edited by G. E. G. Catlin. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929.

Miller, S. M.; Pamela A. Roby; and Daphne Joslin. "Social Issues of the Future," Handbook on the Study of Social Problems. Edited by Erwin O. Smigel. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971.

Millett, Kate. Sexual Politics. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1970.

Rowbotham, Sheila. Women, Resistance and Revolution: A History of Women and Revolution in the Modern World. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.

Smith, Page. Daughters of the Promised Land. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1970.

Tiger, Lionel. Men in Groups. New York: Random House, 1969.

Weinberg, Ian. "Social Problems That Are No More," Handbook on the Study of Social Problems. Edited by Erwin O. Smigel. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1971.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. "Vindication of the Rights of Women." In The Rights of Women: The Subjection of Women. Edited by G. E. G. Catlin. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1929.

Yarmolinsky, Adam. The Military Establishment. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Articles and Periodicals

"About 'Equal Rights'." U.S. News & World Report, 29 October 1973, p. 89.

"Academies Face Suit." New York Times, 30 September 1973, sec. 1, p. 76.

Air Force Times. 1972 - 1974.

Bass, Bernard; Judith Krusell; Ralph A. Alexander. "Male Manager's Attitudes Toward Working Women." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), pp. 221-236.

"Bill Would Admit Women Cadets." Air Force Times, 17 October 1973, p. 4.

"Coeds Record More Campus Gains." Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

Colonnelli, Elaine. "LA Woman Aided Launch of Movement's 2nd Wave." Montgomery (Alabama) Advertiser, 26 December 1973, p. 16.

"Comeback for the ROTC?" U.S. News & World Report, 24 September 1973, pp. 80-81.

"Controversy Over the 'Equal Rights for Women' Amendment." Congressional Digest, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1971), pp. 1-32.

DeLamater, John and Linda S. Fidell. "On the Status of Women." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), pp. 163-171.

Faitermayer, Edmund. "Youth After the Revolution," Fortune, March 1973, pp. 144-158.

"For the Record." National Review, 26 October 1973, p. 1150.

Foster, George. "'Men Only' Academy Fight Nears." Air Force Times, 2 January 1974, p. 13.

Freeman, Jo. "The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), pp. 792-811.

Fretz, C. F. and Joanne Hayman. "Progress for Women--Men are Still More Equal." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 51 (September/October 1973), pp. 133-142.

Friedan, Betty. "Human . . . Not Class!" Social Policy, Vol. 3 (March/April 1973), pp. 32-38.

Gehret, Kenneth. "Feminist Rights Move Front and Center on Campus." Christian Science Monitor, 10 February 1973, p. 14.

Gilder, George. "On Rediscovering the Difference." National Review, 3 August 1973, pp. 832-834.

"Girl Denied Admission." Montgomery Advertiser and Alabama Journal, 20 January 1974, p. 5C.

Goldman, Nancy. "The Changing Role of Women in the Armed Forces." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), pp. 892-911.

--------. "The Utilization of Women in the Military." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 406 (March 1973), pp. 107-116.

Holm, Colonel Jeanne M. "Women and Future Manpower Needs." Defense Management Journal, Vol. 6 (Winter 1970), pp. 6-11.

Infantine, T. Stuart. "Girls' School Goes Coed." Christian Science Monitor, 10 February 1973, p. 14.

Journal of Higher Education. 1972-1973.

Komarovsky, Mirra. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (January 1973), pp. 873-884.

"League of Women Voters Starts Equal Rights Drive." New York Times, 12 October 1973, p. 46.

Leavitt, William. "Air Force Academy: A Time of Transition." Air Force, October 1973, pp. 31-37.

Leith, Lucia Johnson. "Women's Lobby--Feminist Legislation Its Goal." Christian Science Monitor, 18 June 1973, p. 8.

Loercher, Diana. "Barricades are but Part of the Story." Christian Science Monitor, 4 April 1973, p. 15.

--------. "Women Heft Law as Equality Weapon." Christian Science Monitor, 3 April 1973, p. 11.

Mitchell, Joyce M. and Rachel R. Starr. "Recruitment of Academic Women." American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), pp. 183-205.

Mouckley, Florence. "Critics, Boosters Collide in Women's Rights Debate." Christian Science Monitor, 13 March 1973, pp. 1, 8.

"The New Campus Rebels: Women." Newsweek, 10 December 1973, pp. 120-126.

"Now Military is Putting Women Into 'Men Only' Jobs." U.S. News & World Report, 10 December 1973, pp. 82-84.

"Official Sees 'Second Wave of Feminism'." Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

"Ohio Ratifies ERA." Christian Science Monitor, 8 February 1974, p. 8.

Pattridge, Robert. "AFA Gives Us Men to Match our Mountains." Denver Post, 7 October 1973, p. 17.

Peterson, Iver. "R.O.T.C. Apparently Making Cautious Comeback at Many Colleges." New York Times, 25 October 1973, p. 36.

Prather, Jane. "Why Can't Women be More Like Men?" American Behavioral Scientist, Vol. 15 (November/December 1971), pp. 172-182.

Schmidt, Dana Adams. "Military Service No Longer a Man's World." Christian Science Monitor, 13 August 1973, p. 9.

Shaffer, Helen B. "Women's Consciousness Raising." Editorial Research Reports, Vol. 2 (5 July 1973), pp. 499-516.

Stimpson, Catharine. "The New Feminism and Women's Studies." Change, Vol. 5 (September 1973), pp. 43-48.

Trent, Nan. "19th-Century Feminists Would Have Cheered." Christian Science Monitor, 2 April 1973, p. 9.

Tully, Andrew. "Capital Fare." Montgomery Advertiser and Alabama Journal, 6 January 1974, p. 4A.

Turner, Hester. "Women in the Military Services." Defense Management Journal, Vol. 6 (Winter 1970), pp. 12-15.

U.S. Code: Congressional and Administrative News, No. 4 (15 May 1973), pp. 779-796.

Wamsley, Garl L. "Contrasting Institutions of Air Force Socialization: Happenstance or Bellwether?" American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78 (September 1972), pp. 399-417.

"Women Sue Service Academies." Washington Post, 27 September 1973, p. A34.

"Women's Colleges Defended." Christian Science Monitor, 17 February 1973, p. 12.

"Women's Rights and Women's Lib." Editorial, Christian Science Monitor, 16 April 1973, p. 15.

Zuer, Robert. "And Then There Were Women . . . ." Christian Science Monitor, 10 February 1973, p. 14.

Official Documents

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Report of the Commission. Population and the American Future. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Laird, Melvin R. Report to the President and the Chairmen of Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives (P.L. 92-129). Progress in Ending the Draft and Achieving the All-Volunteer Force. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

McLucas, John L. "Achieving an Effective Air Force in Peacetime." Supplement to the Air Force Policy Letter for Commanders, AFRP 190-2, No. 12-1973 (December 1973), pp. 7-14.

United States Air Force Academy Operations Plan Number 36-72, 15 September 1972.

United States Air Force Academy Operations Plan Number 7-73, 10 December 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. A Bill to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall be Made Without Regard to a Candidate's Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs. H.R. 10705, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. A Bill to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall be Made Without Regard to a Candidate's Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs. H.R. 11267, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. A Bill to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall be Made Without Regard to a Candidate's Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs. H.R. 11268, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. A Bill to Insure That Each Admission to the Service Academies Shall be Made Without Regard to a Candidate's Sex, Race, Color, or Religious Beliefs. H.R. 11711, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Department of Defense Appropriations for 1974. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Cost Escalation in Defense Procurement Contracts and Military Posture and H.R. 6722. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services. 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Status Report on Junior and Senior ROTC Programs. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on Armed Services. 92d Cong., 2d sess., 1972.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Judiciary. Equal Rights for Men and Women 1971. Hearings before Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary. 92d Cong., 1st sess., 1971.

U.S. Congress. House. "Permitting Two Iranian Citizens to Attend U.S. Naval Academy." 93d Cong., 1st sess., 6 November 1973. Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 169, p. H9594.

U.S. Congress. House. "Public Bills and Resolutions." 93d Cong., 1st sess., 30 November 1973. Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 185, p. H10465.

U.S. Congress. House. "Women in Military Academies." 93d Cong., 1st sess., 3 October 1973, Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 147, p. H8615.

U.S. Congress. Senate. An Act to Amend Chapter 5 of Title 37, United States Code, to Revise the Special Pay Bonus Structure Relating to Members of the Armed Forces, and for Other Purposes. S. 2771, 93d Cong., 1st sess., 1973.

U.S. Congress. Senate. "Armed Forces Enlisted Personnel Bonus Revision Act." 93d Cong., 1st sess., 20 December 1973. Congressional Record, Vol. 119, No. 201, pp. S23606 - 23609.

U.S. Congress. Senate. "Equal Rights for Men and Women." 92d Cong., 2d sess., 22 March 1972. Congressional Record, Vol. 118, No. 44, pp. S4531-4613.

Unpublished Material

Funnell, Wing Commander Raymond G. "Introducing Social Change to the Military." Unpublished Air War College research study, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 1972.

Goldman, Nancy. "Women in the National Military Establishment." Remarks at The Inter-University Seminar Conference, n.p., 19 November 1971.

Landry, Capt Floyd D. "The Potential for Women in the Air National Guard with Respect to the All-Volunteer Concept." Unpublished Air Command and Staff College research study, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 1972.

Larson, Colonel Doyle E. "WAF: An Outdated Acronym." Unpublished Air War College research study, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 1971.

Williams, Major Edward H. "A Military Dilemma: Equal Rights, for Women." Unpublished Air Command and Staff College research study, Air University, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, 1971.

Other Sources

Lewis, Major General Oliver W., Director of Personnel Programs, Headquarters USAF, Washington, D.C. Personal interview on 25 January 1974.

Morey, Captain Ronald L., Action Officer, Directorate of Personnel Programs, Headquarters USAF, Washington, D.C. Telephone interview on 12 February 1974.

NBC. "Today." 25 February 1974, Newscast with Barbara Walters.

Shirey, Joseph, Cadet Third Class, United States Air Force Academy, Colorado. Personal interview on 4 January 1974.